

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 27, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement imposed under 35 U.S.C. § 121 is respectfully requested.

A requirement was imposed under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to restrict the application to one of the following inventions:

Group I, Claims 1-16, drawn to a hub assembly, classified in class 188, subclass 382; and

Group II, Claims 17-20, drawn to a method of assembling a hub, classified in class 29, subclass 428.

Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 1-16, for prosecution on the merits.

The restriction requirement is traversed. MPEP Section 803 states that if “the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the search and examination of the entire application (Groups I and II) can be made without serious burden. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request examination of Groups I and II.

In addition, requirements for restriction are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. § 121.  
Accordingly, reconsideration of the restriction requirement is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Eric T. Krischke  
Registration No. 42,769  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070